arXiv:1210.8401v2 [math.AP] 24 Dec 2012

SADDLE POINT SOLUTIONS
FOR NON-LOCAL ELLIPTIC OPERATORS

ALESSIO FISCELLA

Abstract. The paper deals with equations driven by a non-local integrodifferential operator $\mathcal{L}_K$ with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. These equations have a variational structure and we find a solution for them using the Saddle Point Theorem. We prove this result for a general integrodifferential operator of fractional type and from this, as a particular case, one can derive an existence theorem for the fractional Laplacian, finding solutions of the equation

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = f(x,u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega\,, \end{cases}$$

where the nonlinear term f satisfies a linear growth condition.

1. Introduction

In this paper we deal with the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_K u = f(x,u) + h(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $n > 2s$ with $s \in (0,1)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open bounded set with Lipschistz boundary, f and h are two functions whose properties will be introduced later and $\mathcal{L}_K$ is a non-local operator defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_K u(x) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u(x+y) + u(x-y) - 2u(x))K(y)dy, \tag{2}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ is a function with the properties that

- (K1) $mK \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $m(x) = \min\left\{|x|^2, 1\right\}$;
- (K2) there exists $\lambda > 0$ and $s \in (0,1)$ such that $K(x) \geq \lambda |x|^{-(n+2s)}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$;
- (K3) $K(x) = K(-x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$.

A typical example for K is given by $K(x) = |x|^{-(n+2s)}$. In this case problem (1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = f(x,u) + h(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where $-(-\Delta)^s$ is the fractional Laplace operator which (up to normalization factors) may be defined as

$$-(-\Delta)^s u(x) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x+y) + u(x-y) - 2u(x)}{|y|^{n+2s}}\, dy \tag{4}$$

Date: December 27, 2012.

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (see [2] and references therein for further details on the fractional Laplacian).

Problem (1) has a variational nature and its solutions can be constructed as critical points of the associated Euler-Lagrange functional. When the function f has superlinear and subcritical growth conditions, the solutions of (1) can be found by using the Mountain Pass Theorem. See for example [8].

When the right-hand side of equation (1) is equal to $f(x,u)+\lambda u$, with λ a real parameter and the nonlinear term f satisfies superlinear and subcritical growth conditions, we refer to [10]. In this case critical points of the Euler-Lagrange functional can be obtained by using both the Mountain Pass Theorem and the Linking Theorem.

In this paper we assume a linear growth for function f for which the previous variational techniques do not apply. Hence the main aim of this work is to adapt the Saddle Point technique for elliptic partial differential equations to problem (1).

The weak formulation of (1) is given by the following problem (for this, it is worth to assume (K3))

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}}(u(x)-u(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))K(x-y)dx\,dy \\ \displaystyle\qquad\qquad\qquad = \int_\Omega f(x,u(x))\varphi(x)dx + \int_\Omega h(x)\varphi(x)dx \quad \forall\varphi\in X_0 \\ u\in X_0. \end{array}\right. \tag{5}$$

Here the functional space X denotes the linear space of Lebesgue measurable functions from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that the restriction to Ω of any function g in X belongs to $L^2(\Omega)$ and

(6) the map $(x,y)\mapsto(g(x)-g(y))\sqrt{K(x-y)}$ is in $L^2\big(\mathbb{R}^{2n}\setminus(\mathcal{C}\Omega\times\mathcal{C}\Omega), dxdy\big)$,

where $\mathcal{C}\Omega := \mathbb{R}^n\setminus\Omega$. Moreover,

$$X_0 = \{g\in X : g=0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n\setminus\Omega\}\,. \tag{7}$$

We remark that X and X_0 are not reduced to $\{0\}$ since by [7, Lemma 11] it follows that $C_0^2(\Omega)\subseteq X_0$ (for this we need condition (K1)).

Finally, we suppose that the term f of the right-hand side of equation (1) is a Carathéodory function $f:\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{c}\text{there exist } a\in L^2(\Omega) \text{ and } b\geq 0 \text{ such that}\\ |f(x,t)|\leq a(x)+b\,|t| \;\; \forall t\in\mathbb{R} \text{ and a.e. } x\in\Omega.\end{array} \tag{8}$$

The main result of the present paper is an existence theorem for equations driven by general integrodifferential operators of non-local fractional type, as stated here below.

Theorem 1. *Let $s\in(0,1)$, $n>2s$ and Ω be a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with Lipschitz boundary. Let K be a function satisfying (K1)–(K3) and let f be a Carathéodory function verifying* (8)*. Moreover, assume that*

$$\liminf_{|t|\to\infty}\frac{f(x,t)}{t} := \underline{\alpha}(x) \leq \limsup_{|t|\to\infty}\frac{f(x,t)}{t} := \overline{\alpha}(x) \tag{9}$$

are measurable functions. If $\overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_1$ *or there exists* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $\lambda_k < \underline{\alpha}(x) \leq \overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$ *(where* λ_1 *and* λ_k *are respectively the first and the k-th eigenvalue of* $\mathcal{L}_K$ *which we will recall in Section 4), then problem* (5) *admits a solution* $u \in X_0$ *for any* $h \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Remark 2. Without loss of generality, we can assume $h \equiv 0$, since the function $\widetilde{f}(x,t) = f(x,t) + h(x)$ satisfies the same assumptions of f.

Remark 3. We point out that assumption $n > 2s$ is just a technical condition. Indeed, when $n = 1$ and $s \in (1/2, 1)$ by [2, Theorem 8.2] we get the following compact embedding $X_0 \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ for any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and the result works exactly as in the other case.

Remark 4. We notice that, in our framework, no solution of problem (5) is known from the beginning, unlike the cases treated in [8, 10] where the problems considered admit the trivial solution $u \equiv 0$ (indeed, in our case, $f(x,0) + h(x)$ may not vanish and $u \equiv 0$ may not be a solution).

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on the Saddle Point Theorem (see, for instance, [4]). In order to check the geometric assumptions needed for applying this result, we perform some energy estimates in fractional Sobolev spaces. Indeed, Theorem 1 is the fractional analog of a result valid for the classical Laplacian (see, e.g., [3, Theorem 4.1.1]). As a matter of fact, we plan to consider further applications of the Saddle Point Theorem for fractional operators for asymptotically linear terms in a forthcoming paper.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we collect some preliminary estimates on the primitive of f. In Section 3 we introduce the functional setting we will work in. In Section 4 we recall some basic facts on the spectral theory of the operator $\mathcal{L}_K$. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1 performing the classical Saddle Point Theorem. Finally, in the appendix we give the proof of a technical lemma.

2. Some preliminary estimates

Here we use condition (8) on f to deduce some preliminary estimates involving its primitive F with respect to the second variable, that is

$$F(x,t) = \int_0^t f(x,\tau)d\tau. \tag{10}$$

At first we immediately notice that, by integrating (8), it follows that

$$|F(x,t)| \leq a(x)\,|t| + b\frac{|t|^2}{2} \;\; \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and a.e. } x \in \Omega. \tag{11}$$

Lemma 5. *Assume* f *is a Carathéodory function satisfying the condition* (8). *Then, the primitive function* F *verifies the following inequalities*

$$\limsup_{|t|\to\infty} \frac{F(x,t)}{t^2} \leq \frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2}, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\liminf_{|t|\to\infty} \frac{F(x,t)}{t^2} \geq \frac{\underline{\alpha}(x)}{2}, \tag{13}$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ *and* $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$, *where* $\overline{\alpha}$ *and* $\underline{\alpha}$ *are defined as in* (9).

Proof. By (9), for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$\frac{f(x,t)}{t} - \overline{\alpha}(x) < \epsilon \quad \forall\, |t| > R. \tag{14}$$

Integrating and recalling (11) we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(x,t) &\leq |F(x,R)| + \int_R^{|t|} f(x,s)ds \\ &\leq a(x)R + b\frac{R^2}{2} + \frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)+\epsilon}{2}(t^2 - R^2) \quad \forall\, |t| > R. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{|t|\to+\infty} \frac{F(x,t)}{t^2} \leq \frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)+\epsilon}{2}$$

for every $\epsilon > 0$, and so (12) follows. In analogous way one can prove (13). $\square$

3. The functional analytic setting and some preliminary estimates

Here we recall some preliminary results on X and X_0 as defined in (6) and (7). In the sequel we denote by $Q = \mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus \mathcal{O}$, where

$$\mathcal{O} = (\mathcal{C}\Omega) \times (\mathcal{C}\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \tag{16}$$

and $\mathcal{C}\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$.

The space X is endowed with the norm defined as

$$\|g\|_X = \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \Big(\int_Q |g(x) - g(y)|^2 K(x-y) dx\, dy \Big)^{1/2}. \tag{17}$$

see [7, 8] for further details.

In the following we denote by $H^s(\Omega)$ the usual fractional Sobolev space endowed with the norm (the so-called *Gagliardo norm*)

$$\|g\|_{H^s(\Omega)} = \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \Big(\int_{\Omega\times\Omega} \frac{|g(x)-g(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{n+2s}}\, dx\, dy \Big)^{1/2}. \tag{18}$$

We remark that, even in the model case in which $K(x) = |x|^{-(n+2s)}$, the norms in (17) and (18) are not the same, because $\Omega \times \Omega$ is strictly contained in Q (this makes the classical fractional Sobolev space approach not sufficient for studying the problem).

For further details on the fractional Sobolev spaces we refer to [2] and to the references therein.

In the next result we recall the connections between the spaces X and X_0 with the usual fractional Sobolev spaces (for a proof see [8, Lemma 5]).

Lemma 6. *Let $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ satisfy assumption (K1)–(K3). Then the following assertions hold true:*

a) if $v \in X$, then $v \in H^s(\Omega)$. Moreover

$$\|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \leq c(\lambda)\|v\|_X\,;$$

b) if $v \in X_0$, then $v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover

$$\|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \leq \|v\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq c(\lambda)\|v\|_X\,.$$

In both cases $c(\lambda) = \max\{1, \lambda^{-1/2}\}$, *where* λ *is given in (K2).*

Now we give a sort of Poincaré inequality for functions in X_0. This result is proved in [8, Lemma 6].

Lemma 7. *Let* $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ *satisfy assumption (K1)–(K3). Then*

a) there exists a positive constant c*, depending only on* n *and* s*, such that for any* $v \in X_0$

$$\|v\|^2_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} = \|v\|^2_{L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le c \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{n+2s}}\, dx\, dy\,,$$

where

$$2^* = \frac{2n}{n-2s} \tag{19}$$

with $s \in (0,1)$*;*

b) there exists a constant $C > 1$*, depending only on* n*,* s*,* λ *and* Ω*, such that for any* $v \in X_0$

$$\int_Q |v(x) - v(y)|^2 K(x-y)\, dx\, dy \le \|v\|^2_X \le C \int_Q |v(x) - v(y)|^2 K(x-y)\, dx\, dy\,,$$

that is

$$\|v\|_{X_0} = \left(\int_Q |v(x) - v(y)|^2 K(x-y)\, dx\, dy \right)^{1/2} \tag{20}$$

is a norm on X_0 *equivalent to the usual one defined in* (17)*.*

From now on, we take (20) as norm on X_0. The following result holds true (see [8, Lemma 7] for the proof).

Lemma 8. $(X_0, \|\cdot\|_{X_0})$ *is a Hilbert space with the scalar product*

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{X_0} = \int_Q (u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y)) K(x-y)\, dx\, dy. \tag{21}$$

Finally, we recall a convergence property for bounded sequences in X_0 (see [8, Lemma 8]).

Lemma 9. *Let* $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ *satisfy assumption (K1)–(K3) and let* v_j *be a bounded sequence in* X_0*. Then, there exists* $v_\infty \in L^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *such that, up to a subsequence,*

$$v_j \to v_\infty \quad in\ L^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

as $j \to +\infty$*, for any* $m \in [1, 2^*)$*.*

4. An eigenvalue problem

Here we consider the following eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_K u = \lambda u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where $n > 2s$ with $s \in (0,1)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open bounded set with Lipschistz boundary, $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ is a function satisfying (K1)–(K3).

More precisely, we study the weak formulation of (22), which consists in the following eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (u(x)-u(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))K(x-y)dx\,dy \\ \displaystyle\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad = \lambda \int_\Omega u(x)\varphi(x)dx \quad \forall \varphi \in X_0 \\ u \in X_0. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

We recall that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an eigenvalue of $-\mathcal{L}_K u$ provided there exists a non-trivial solution $u \in X_0$ of problem (23) and, in this case, any solution will be called an eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue λ.

For the proof of the next result we refer to [10, Proposition 9 and Appendix A].

Proposition 10. *Let $s \in (0,1)$, $n > 2s$, Ω be an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0,+\infty)$ be a function satisfying assumptions (K1)–(K3). Then*

a) problem (23) admits an eigenvalue λ_1 which is positive and that can be characterized as follows

$$\lambda_1 = \min_{u\in X_0,\, \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |u(x)-u(y)|^2 K(x-y)dx\,dy,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\lambda_1 = \min_{u \in X_0\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |u(x)-u(y)|^2 K(x-y)dx\,dy}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |u(x)|^2 dx}; \tag{24}$$

b) there exists a non-negative function $e_1 \in X_0$, which is an eigenfunction corresponding to λ_1, attaining the minimum in (24), that is $\|e_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1$ and

$$\lambda_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |e_1(x)-e_1(y)|^2 K(x-y)dx\,dy;$$

c) λ_1 is simple, that is if $u \in X_0$ is a solution of the following equation

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (u(x)-u(y))(\phi(x)-\phi(y))K(x-y)dx\,dy = \lambda_1 \int_\Omega u(x)\phi(x)dx \quad \forall \phi \in X_0,$$

then $u = \zeta e_1$, with $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$;

d) the set of the eigenvalues of problem (23) consists of a sequence $\{\lambda_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ with

$$0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \le \ldots \le \lambda_k \le \lambda_{k+1} \le \ldots \tag{25}$$

and

$$\lambda_k \to +\infty \text{ as } k \to +\infty.$$

Moreover for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the eigenvalues can be characterized as follows:

$$\lambda_{k+1} = \min_{u\in\mathbb{P}_{k+1},\, \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |u(x)-u(y)|^2 K(x-y)dx\,dy,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\lambda_{k+1} = \min_{u \in \mathbb{P}_{k+1} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |u(x) - u(y)|^2 \, K(x-y) dx\, dy}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |u(x)|^2 \, dx}, \tag{26}$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}_{k+1} := \Big\{ u \in X_0 : \langle u, e_j \rangle_{X_0} = 0 \quad \forall j = 1, \ldots, k \Big\};$$

e) for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function $e_{k+1} \in \mathbb{P}_{k+1}$, which is an eigenfunction corresponding to λ_{k+1}, attaining the minimum in (26), that is $\|e_{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1$ and

$$\lambda_{k+1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |e_{k+1}(x) - e_{k+1}(y)|^2 \, K(x-y) dx\, dy; \tag{27}$$

f) the sequence $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of eigenfunctions corresponding to λ_k is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Omega)$ and an orthogonal basis of X_0;

g) each eigenvalue λ_k has finite multiplicity; more precisely, if λ_k is such that

$$\lambda_{k-1} < \lambda_k = \ldots = \lambda_{k+h} < \lambda_{k+h+1}$$

for some $h \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then the set of all the eigenfunctions corresponding to λ_k agrees with

$$span\,\{e_k, \ldots, e_{k+h}\}.$$

5. Proof of Theorem 1

For the proof of Theorem 1, we observe that problem (5) has a variational structure, indeed it is the Euler-Lagrange equation of the functional $\mathcal{J} : X_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows

$$\mathcal{J}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_Q |u(x) - u(y)|^2 K(x-y)\, dx\, dy - \int_\Omega F(x, u(x)) dx.$$

Note that the functional $\mathcal{J}$ is Fréchet differentiable in $u \in X_0$ and for any $\varphi \in X_0$

$$\langle \mathcal{J}'(u), \varphi \rangle = \int_Q \big(u(x) - u(y)\big)\big(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)\big) K(x-y)\, dx\, dy - \int_\Omega f(x, u(x)) \varphi(x)\, dx.$$

Thus, critical points of $\mathcal{J}$ are solutions to problem (5). In order to find these critical points, we will divide the proof in two cases. At first, when $\overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_1$ the existence of the solution of problem (5) follows from the Weierstrass Theorem (i.e. by direct minimization). When $\lambda_k < \underline{\alpha}(x) \le \overline{\alpha} < \lambda_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we will make use of the Saddle Point Theorem (see [4]). For this, we have to check that the functional $\mathcal{J}$ has a particular geometric structure (as stated, e.g., in conditions (I_3) and (I_4) of [4, Theorem 4.6]) and that it satisfies the Palais–Smale compactness condition (see, for instance, [4, page 3]).

5.1. **The case $\overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_1$.** In this subsection, in order to apply the Weierstrass Theorem we first verify that the functional $\mathcal{J}$ satisfy the following geometric feature.

Proposition 11. *Let $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ satisfy assumptions (K1)–(K3). Moreover let $\overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_1$ and let f be a function satisfying* (8)*. Then the functional $\mathcal{J}$ verifies*

$$\liminf_{\|u\|_{X_0} \to +\infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}(u)}{\|u\|^2_{X_0}} > 0. \tag{28}$$

Proof. Let $\{u_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in X_0 such that $\|u_j\|_{X_0} \to +\infty$. Since X_0 is a reflexive space (being a Hilbert space, by Lemma 8), up to a subsequence, there exists $u \in X_0$ such that $u_j / \|u_j\|_{X_0}$ converges to u weakly in X_0. Moreover, by applying Lemma 9 and [1, Theorem IV.9]

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{u_j}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \to u \quad \text{in } L^q(\mathbb{R}^n) \ \ \forall q \in [1, 2^*) \\ &\frac{u_j}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \to u \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

as $j \to +\infty$ and $\|u\|_{X_0} \le 1$. Now, notice that $2^* > 2$, by (19); therefore by (11) and the first observation in (29)

$$\frac{|F(x, u_j(x))|}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} \le \frac{a(x)\,|u_j(x)| + b\dfrac{|u_j(x)|^2}{2}}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} \to \frac{b}{2}u^2(x) \ \ \text{in } L^1(\Omega). \tag{30}$$

So, by (30) and [1, Theorem IV.9], up to a subsequence, there exists a function $h \in L^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\frac{|F(x, u_j(x))|}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} \le h(x) \quad \text{a.e. in}\, \Omega. \tag{31}$$

By (31) and the generalized Fatou Lemma it follows that

$$\limsup_{j\to+\infty} \int_\Omega \frac{F(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} dx \le \int_\Omega \limsup_{j\to+\infty} \frac{F(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} dx. \tag{32}$$

Now, we claim that

$$\limsup_{j\to+\infty} \frac{F(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} \le \frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2} u^2(x) \tag{33}$$

a.e. in Ω. By fixing $\epsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Omega$, by (29) there exists $j_{\epsilon,\,x} > 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{u_j^2(x)}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} - u^2(x) \right| < \epsilon \tag{34}$$

for $j \ge j_{\epsilon,\,x}$. Moreover, by (12) there exists $t_{\epsilon,\,x} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{F(x,t)}{t^2} \le \frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2} + \epsilon \tag{35}$$

for any $|t| \geq t_\epsilon$. Now, if $|u_j(x)| > t_{\epsilon,\,x}$ by (34) and (35) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{F(x,u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} &\leq \left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2}+\epsilon\right)\frac{u_j^2(x)}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}}\\ &= \left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2}+\epsilon\right)u^2(x)+\left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2}+\epsilon\right)\left(\frac{u_j^2(x)}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}}-u^2(x)\right)\\ &\leq \left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2}+\epsilon\right)u^2(x)+\left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}^+(x)}{2}+\epsilon\right)\epsilon,\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

for $j \geq j_{\epsilon,\,x}$, with $\overline{\alpha}^+(x) = \max\{\overline{\alpha}(x), 0\}$. Since $\|u_j\|_{X_0} \to +\infty$, if $|u_j(x)| \leq t_{\epsilon,\,x}$ for $j \geq j_{\epsilon,\,x}$ sufficiently large, by (11) we get

$$\frac{F(x,u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} \leq \frac{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}\,t_{\epsilon,\,x}+\frac{b}{2}t^2_{\epsilon,\,x}}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} \leq \left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}^+(x)}{2}+\epsilon\right)\epsilon. \tag{37}$$

By combining (36) and (37), for $j \geq j_{\epsilon,\,x}$ we obtain

$$\frac{F(x,u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} \leq \left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2}+\epsilon\right)u^2(x)+\left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}^+(x)}{2}+\epsilon\right)\epsilon,$$

and so by sending $j \to +\infty$ and then $\epsilon \to 0$ we get (33), proving our claim. Therefore, by (32), (33) and remembering that $\overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_1$, we have

$$\limsup_{j\to+\infty}\int_\Omega \frac{F(x,u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}}dx \leq \int_\Omega \frac{\overline{\alpha}(x)}{2}u^2(x)dx \begin{cases} < \dfrac{\lambda_1}{2}\displaystyle\int_\Omega u^2(x)dx & \text{if } u \not\equiv 0,\\ = 0 & \text{if } u \equiv 0,\end{cases}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{j\to+\infty}\frac{\mathcal{J}(u_j)}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} &= \frac{1}{2}-\limsup_{j\to+\infty}\int_\Omega\frac{F(x,u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}}dx\\ &> \begin{cases}\dfrac{1}{2}-\dfrac{\lambda_1}{2}\displaystyle\int_\Omega u^2(x)dx & \text{if } u \not\equiv 0,\\ \dfrac{1}{2} & \text{if } u \equiv 0.\end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Now, by (20), (24) and remembering that $\|u\|_{X_0} \leq 1$, we get

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{2}\int_\Omega u^2(x)dx \leq \frac{1}{2}\int_Q |u(x)-u(y)|^2 K(x-y)\,dx\,dy = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{X_0} \leq \frac{1}{2} \tag{39}$$

therefore

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty}\frac{\mathcal{J}(u_j)}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} > \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \not\equiv 0,\\ \dfrac{1}{2} & \text{if } u \equiv 0,\end{cases}$$

and so we have (28). □

Proof of Theorem 1, when $\overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_1$. Let us note that the map $u \mapsto \|u\|^2_{X_0}$ is lower semicontinuous in the weak topology of X_0, while the map $u \mapsto \int_\Omega F(x,u)$ is continuous in the weak topology of X_0. Indeed, if $\{u_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in X_0 such that $u_j \rightharpoonup u$ in X_0, then by Lemma 9 and [1, Theorem IV.9], up to a subsequence, u_j converges to u strongly in $L^q(\Omega)$ for any $q \in [1, 2^*)$ and a.e. in Ω and it is dominated in $L^q(\Omega)$. Since F is a Carathéodory function and by (11) it follows that

$$|F(x,u_j(x))| \leq a(x)\,|u_j(x)| + \frac{b}{2}\,|u_j(x)|^2\,,$$

by applying the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem we have the continuity of $u \mapsto \int_\Omega F(x,u)$. So the functional $\mathcal{J}$ is lower semicontinuous and by using also (28) to obtain coerciveness we can apply the Weierstrass Theorem in order to find a minimum of $\mathcal{J}$ on X_0, which is clearly a solution of problem (5). $\square$

5.2. **The case $\lambda_k < \underline{\alpha}(x) \leq \overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$.** At first, we recall that, in what follows, e_k will be the k-th eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_k of $-\mathcal{L}_K$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\mathbb{P}_{k+1} := \Big\{u \in X_0 : \ \langle u, e_j\rangle_{X_0} = 0 \ \ \forall j = 1,\ldots,k\Big\}$$

as defined in Proposition 10, while $H_k := \operatorname{span}\{e_1,\ldots,e_k\}$ will denote the linear subspace generated by the first k eigenfunctions of $-\mathcal{L}_K$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It is immediate to observe that $\mathbb{P}_{k+1} = H_k^{\perp}$ with respect to the scalar product in X_0 (recall (21)). Moreover, since X_0 is a Hilbert space (thanks to Lemma 8), we can divide it as $X_0 = H_k \oplus \mathbb{P}_{k+1}$.

Now we prove that the functional $\mathcal{J}$ has the geometric features required by the Saddle Point Theorem.

Proposition 12. *Let $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0,+\infty)$ satisfy assumptions (K1)–(K3). Moreover, assume there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lambda_k < \underline{\alpha}(x) \leq \overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$ and let f be a function satisfying* (8). *Then the functional $\mathcal{J}$ verifies*

$$\limsup_{u \in H_k,\, \|u\|_{X_0} \to +\infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}(u)}{\|u\|_{X_0}^2} < 0. \tag{40}$$

Proof. Let $\{u_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in H_k such that $\|u_j\|_{X_0} \to +\infty$. Since H_k is finite dimensional there exists $u \in H_k$ such that $u_j/\|u_j\|_{X_0}$ converges to u strongly in X_0. Moreover, by applying Lemma 9 and [1, Theorem IV.9], up to a subsequence

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{u_j}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \to u \quad \text{in } L^q(\mathbb{R}^n) \ \ \forall q \in [1,2^*) \\ &\frac{u_j}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \to u \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

as $j \to +\infty$ and $\|u\|_{X_0} = 1$. Now, by using (13) and proceeding as in the proof of claim (33), it follows that

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \frac{F(x,u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}^2} \geq \frac{\underline{\alpha}(x)}{2}u^2(x), \tag{42}$$

a.e. in Ω. So by (42), the Fatou Lemma and the fact that $\underline{\alpha}(x) > \lambda_k$ we get

$$\limsup_{j\to+\infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}(u_j)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} - \int_\Omega \frac{\underline{\alpha}(x)}{2}u^2(x)dx < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\lambda_k}{2}\int_\Omega u^2(x)dx. \tag{43}$$

Now, since $u \in H_k$, then we can write

$$u(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i e_i(x)$$

with $u_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Moreover, since $\{e_1, \dots, e_k, \dots\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Omega)$ and an orthogonal one of X_0 and by (25) and (27), we get

$$\|u\|^2_{X_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 \, \|e_i\|^2_{X_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i u_i^2 \leq \lambda_k \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 = \lambda_k \int_\Omega u^2(x)dx. \tag{44}$$

So, by (43), (44) and the fact that $\|u\|_{X_0} = 1$, we get (40). □

Also, Proposition 12 has the following counterpart.

Proposition 13. *Let* $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ *satisfy assumptions (K1)–(K3). Moreover, assume there exists* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $\lambda_k < \underline{\alpha}(x) \leq \overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$ *and let* f *be a function satisfying* (8)*. Then the functional* $\mathcal{J}$ *verifies*

$$\liminf_{u \in \mathbb{P}_{k+1},\, \|u\|_{X_0} \to +\infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}(u)}{\|u\|^2_{X_0}} > 0. \tag{45}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 11. In this case $\overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, so (38) becomes

$$\liminf_{j \to +\infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}(u_j)}{\|u_j\|^2_{X_0}} > \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{2} - \dfrac{\lambda_{k+1}}{2} \displaystyle\int_\Omega u^2(x)dx & \text{if } u \not\equiv 0, \\ \dfrac{1}{2} & \text{if } u \equiv 0. \end{cases}$$

In place of (39), by using (26), we get

$$\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{2} \int_\Omega u^2(x)dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_Q |u(x) - u(y)|^2 \, K(x-y)\, dx\, dy \tag{46}$$

and from this point we can conclude exactly as in the proof of Proposition 11. □

In order to prove the Palais-Smale condition we first need the following technical lemma, the proof of which is given in appendix.

Lemma 14. *Let* Ω *be a measurable subset of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *and let* $\{\phi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence of functions of* $L^2(\Omega)$*. If*

$$\phi_j \rightharpoonup \phi \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \tag{47}$$

and there exists two functions $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in L^2(\Omega)$ *such that*

$$\psi_1(x) \leq \liminf_{j \to +\infty} \phi_j(x) \leq \limsup_{j \to +\infty} \phi_j(x) \leq \psi_2(x)$$

a.e. in Ω*, then*

$$\psi_1(x) \leq \phi(x) \leq \psi_2(x)$$

a.e. in Ω*.*

Now, as usual in variational methods, we prove the boundedness of a Palais-Smale sequence.

Proposition 15. *Let* $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ *satisfy assumptions (K1)–(K3). Moreover, assume there exists* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $\lambda_k < \underline{\alpha}(x) \leq \overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$ *and let* f *be a function satisfying* (8)*. Let* $c \in \mathbb{R}$ *and let* $\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence in* X_0 *such that*

$$\mathcal{J}(u_j) \to c, \tag{48}$$

and

$$\sup\Big\{\Big|\Big\langle \mathcal{J}'(u_j),\phi\Big\rangle\Big| : \phi\in X_0,\ \|\phi\|_{X_0}=1\Big\}\to 0 \quad \forall\phi\in X_0, \tag{49}$$

as $j\to+\infty$. *Then* $\{u_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is bounded in* X_0.

Proof. We argue by contradiction and suppose that $\{u_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is unbounded. As usual, up to a subsequence we can assume $\|u_j\|_{X_0}\to+\infty$ as $j\to+\infty$ and there exists $u\in X_0$ such that $u_j/\|u_j\|_{X_0}$ converges to u weakly in X_0, that is

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}}\left(\frac{u_j(x)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}-\frac{u_j(y)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}\right)(\phi(x)-\phi(y))K(x-y)\,dx\,dy\to\\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}}(u(x)-u(y))(\phi(x)-\phi(y))K(x-y)\,dx\,dy \quad \text{for any } \phi\in X_0\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

as $j\to+\infty$. Moreover, by applying Lemma 9 and [1, Theorem IV.9], up to a subsequence

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{u_j}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}\to u \quad \text{in } L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)\ \ \forall q\in[1,2^*)\\ &\frac{u_j}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}\to u \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

as $j\to+\infty$. Moreover, by (8) and the first observation in (51), since $2<2^*$, we get

$$\frac{|f(x,u_j)|}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}\le\frac{a(x)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}+b\frac{|u_j|}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}\to b\,|u| \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega) \tag{52}$$

as $j\to+\infty$. So $f(x,u_j)/\|u_j\|_{X_0}$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ and we can assume that there exists $w\in L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\frac{f(x,u_j)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}\rightharpoonup w \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega). \tag{53}$$

By (49) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\mathcal{J}'(u_j),v\rangle=&\int_Q\big(u_j(x)-u_j(y)\big)\big(v(x)-v(y)\big)K(x-y)\,dx\,dy\\ &-\int_\Omega f(x,u_j(x))v(x)\,dx\ \to 0\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

for all $v\in X_0$. Moreover, by (50) with $\phi=v$ and (53) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\langle\mathcal{J}'(u_j),v\rangle}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}}\longrightarrow&\int_Q\big(u(x)-u(y)\big)\big(v(x)-v(y)\big)K(x-y)\,dx\,dy\\ &-\int_\Omega w(x)v(x)dx \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega).\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

So, by combining (54) with (55) we get

$$\int_Q\big(u(x)-u(y)\big)\big(v(x)-v(y)\big)K(x-y)\,dx\,dy-\int_\Omega w(x)v(x)dx=0$$

for all $v \in X_0$ and we deduce that u is a weak solution of problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_K u(x) = w(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{56}$$

Now we claim that

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{there exists } m \in L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ such that } \underline{\alpha}(x) \le m(x) \le \overline{\alpha}(x) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \\ &\text{and } w = mu. \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

If $x \in \Omega$ such that $u(x) > 0$, then $u_j(x) \to +\infty$ and so, by using (9), it follows that

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} = \liminf_{j\to+\infty} \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{u_j(x)} \frac{u_j(x)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \ge \underline{\alpha}(x)u(x) \tag{58}$$

and in the same way

$$\limsup_{j\to+\infty} \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \le \overline{\alpha}(x)u(x). \tag{59}$$

On the other hand, if $x \in \Omega$ such that $u(x) < 0$, then $u_j(x) \to -\infty$ and we get the reversed sign

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \le \underline{\alpha}(x)u(x) \tag{60}$$

and

$$\limsup_{j\to+\infty} \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \ge \overline{\alpha}(x)u(x). \tag{61}$$

Finally, when $x \in \Omega$ with $u(x) = 0$, by (8) we have

$$\frac{|f(x, u_j(x))|}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \le \frac{a(x)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} + b\frac{|u_j(x)|}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \to 0 \tag{62}$$

as $j \to +\infty$. So, by (53), (58), (59), (60), (61), (62) and Lemma 14, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}(x)u(x) \le w(x) \le \overline{\alpha}(x)u(x) \qquad & \text{if } u(x) > 0, \\ \overline{\alpha}(x)u(x) \le w(x) \le \underline{\alpha}(x)u(x) \qquad & \text{if } u(x) < 0 \text{ and} \\ w(x) = 0 \qquad & \text{if } u(x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we set

$$m(x) := \begin{cases} \dfrac{w(x)}{u(x)} & \text{if } u \ne 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } u = 0, \end{cases} \tag{63}$$

and we observe that m is measurable and bounded, since $\lambda_k < \underline{\alpha}(x) \le m(x) \le \overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$ a.e. in Ω, and $w = mu$. This establishes (57).

So, by (56) and (57) we have proved that u is a weak solution of problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_K u(x) = m(x)u(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{64}$$

Now, we can write $u = u_1 + u_2$, where $u_1 \in H_k$ and $u_2 \in \mathbb{P}_{k+1}$. Multiplying the equation in (64) by u_1 and u_2, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega m(x)u_1^2(x)dx + \int_\Omega m(x)u_1(x)u_2(x)dx = \int_Q |u_1(x) - u_1(y)|^2 K(x-y)dxdy,$$

$$\int_\Omega m(x)u_2^2(x)dx + \int_\Omega m(x)u_1(x)u_2(x)dx = \int_Q |u_2(x) - u_2(y)|^2 K(x-y)dxdy$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_Q |u_1(x) - u_1(y)|^2 K(x-y)\,dx\,dy - \int_\Omega m(x)u_1^2(x)\,dx = \\ &\qquad \int_Q |u_2(x) - u_2(y)|^2 K(x-y)\,dx\,dy - \int_\Omega m(x)u_2^2(x)\,dx. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Now we apply (44) to the function $u_1 \in H_k$ and we conclude that

$$\int_Q |u_1(x) - u_1(y)|^2 K(x-y)\,dx\,dy \le \lambda_k \int_\Omega u_1^2(x)\,dx. \tag{66}$$

Also, by (26) and the fact that $u_2 \in \mathbb{P}_{k+1}$

$$\int_Q |u_2(x) - u_2(y)|^2 K(x-y)\,dx\,dy \ge \lambda_{k+1} \int_\Omega u_2^2(x)\,dx. \tag{67}$$

Therefore, by (65), (66) and (67) and by considering that

$$\lambda_k - m(x) \le \lambda_k - \underline{\alpha}(x) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{k+1} - m(x) \ge \lambda_{k+1} - \overline{\alpha}(x) > 0 \tag{68}$$

we get

$$0 \ge \int_\Omega (\lambda_k - m(x))u_1^2(x)dx \ge \int_\Omega (\lambda_{k+1} - m(x))u_2^2(x)dx \ge 0, \tag{69}$$

so that all integrals are zero. But by (68) we get $u_1 = u_2 = 0$ and so $u \equiv 0$.

Now, by (49)

$$0 \leftarrow \frac{\langle \mathcal{J}'(u_j), u_j\rangle}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}^2} = 1 - \int_\Omega \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \frac{u_j(x)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} dx, \tag{70}$$

where, since $f(x, u_j)/\|u_j\|_{X_0}$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ and by using the first observation in (51) and (53), the right-hand side verifies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \frac{u_j(x)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} dx &= \int_\Omega \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} \left(\frac{u_j(x)}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} - u(x) \right) dx \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega \frac{f(x, u_j(x))}{\|u_j\|_{X_0}} u(x)dx \to \int_\Omega w(x)u(x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

as $j \to +\infty$. So by (70) and (71), it follows that $\int_\Omega w(x)u(x)dx = 1$ and we get a contradiction since $u \equiv 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 1, when $\lambda_k < \underline{\alpha}(x) \le \overline{\alpha}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$. At first, we prove that $\mathcal{J}$ satisfies the geometric structure required by the Saddle Point Theorem. By Proposition 13 it follows that for any $M > 0$ there exists $R > 0$ such that if

$u \in \mathbb{P}_{k+1}$ and $\|u\|_{X_0} \geq R$ then $\mathcal{J}(u) \geq M$. If $u \in \mathbb{P}_{k+1}$ with $\|u\|_{X_0} \leq R$, by applying (11), (26) and Hölder inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}(u) &\geq -\int_\Omega F(x,u(x))dx \geq -\int_\Omega a(x)\,|u(x)|\,dx - \frac{b}{2}\int_\Omega u^2(x)dx \\ &\geq -\|a\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - \frac{b}{2}\lambda_{k+1}^{-1}\,\|u\|_{X_0}^2 \geq -C_R\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_R = C(R,\Omega) > 0$. So, we get

$$\mathcal{J}(u) \geq -C_R \qquad \forall u \in \mathbb{P}_{k+1}. \tag{72}$$

By Proposition 12 we can choose $T > 0$ in such way that for any $u \in H_k$ with $\|u\|_{X_0} = T$ we have

$$\sup_{u\in H_k,\,\|u\|_{X_0}=T} \mathcal{J}(u) < -C_R \leq \inf_{u\in\mathbb{P}_{k+1}} \mathcal{J}(u), \tag{73}$$

We have thus proved that $\mathcal{J}$ has the geometric structure of the Saddle Point Theorem (see [4, Theorem 4.6]). Now it remains to check the validity of the Palais-Smale condition. Let $\{u_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in X_0 that satisfies (48) and (49). Since, by Proposition 15, $\{u_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded and X_0 is a reflexive space (being a Hilbert space, by Lemma 8), up to a subsequence, there exists $u \in X_0$ such that u_j converges to u weakly in X_0, that is

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (u_j(x)-u_j(y))(\phi(x)-\phi(y))K(x-y)\,dx\,dy \to \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (u(x)-u(y))(\phi(x)-\phi(y))K(x-y)\,dx\,dy \quad \text{for any } \phi \in X_0\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

as $j \to +\infty$. Moreover, by applying Lemma 9 and [1, Theorem IV.9]

$$\begin{aligned}&u_j \to u \quad \text{in } L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)\ \ \forall q \in [1,2^*) \\ &u_j \to u \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

as $j \to +\infty$. By (49) we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 \leftarrow \langle \mathcal{J}'(u_j),(u_j-u)\rangle &= \int_Q |u_j(x)-u_j(y)|^2\,K(x-y)\,dx\,dy \\ &- \int_Q (u_j(x)-u_j(y))(u(x)-u(y))K(x-y)\,dx\,dy \\ &- \int_\Omega f(x,u_j(x))(u_j(x)-u(x))dx.\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

Now, since u_j is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$, by (8) also $f(x,u_j)$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ and so, by (75) and Hölder inequality, we get

$$\left|\int_\Omega f(x,u_j(x))(u_j(x)-u(x))dx\right| \leq \|u_j-u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\left(\int_\Omega |f(x,u_j(x))|^2\,dx\right)^{1/2} \to 0 \tag{77}$$

as $j \to +\infty$. By (74) with $\phi = u$, (76) and (77) it follows that

$$\int_Q |u_j(x)-u_j(y)|^2\,K(x-y)\,dx\,dy \to \int_Q |u(x)-u(y)|^2\,K(x-y)\,dx\,dy$$

so that

$$\|u_j\|_{X_0} \to \|u\|_{X_0} \tag{78}$$

as $j \to +\infty$. Finally we have that

$$\|u_j - u\|^2_{X_0} = \|u_j\|^2_{X_0} + \|u\|^2_{X_0} - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (u_j(x) - u_j(y))(u(x) - u(y))K(x-y)\,dx\,dy$$
$$\to 2\,\|u\|^2_{X_0} - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |u(x) - u(y)|^2\,K(x-y)\,dx\,dy = 0$$

as $j \to +\infty$, thanks to (74) and (78). Thus, we have proved the Palais-Smale condition and we can make use of the Saddle Point Theorem in order to obtain a critical point $u \in X_0$ of $\mathcal{J}$. $\square$

It is worth pointing out that the solution found in Theorem 1 is unique, under a suitable condition on the nonlinearity.

Corollary 16. *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 1 and if in addition there exist two functions* $\underline{\beta}$, $\overline{\beta} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ *and* $k \geq 1$ *such that*

$$\lambda_k < \underline{\beta}(x) \leq \frac{f(x,u) - f(x,v)}{u - v} \leq \overline{\beta}(x) < \lambda_{k+1} \tag{79}$$

for all u, $v \in \mathbb{R}$ *with* $u \neq v$ *and for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$, *then the solution of problem* (5) *is unique.*

Proof. Let u_1, $u_2 \in X_0$ be two solutions of problem (5). Then $w := u_1 - u_2$ is a solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_K w(x) = f(x, u_1(x)) - f(x, u_2(x)) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{80}$$

Now, by setting

$$m(x) := \begin{cases} \dfrac{f(x, u_1(x)) - f(x, u_2(x))}{u_1(x) - u_2(x)} & \text{if } u_1(x) \neq u_2(x), \\ 0 & \text{if } u_1(x) = u_2(x), \end{cases} \tag{81}$$

we get that w is a solution of problem (64). Moreover, by (79), m is a measurable function that verifies $\lambda_k < \underline{\beta}(x) \leq m(x) \leq \overline{\beta}(x) < \lambda_{k+1}$ a.e. in Ω. As seen in the proof of Proposition 15, problem (64) has a unique solution $u \equiv 0$ and so we get $u_1 = u_2$ concluding the proof. $\square$

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 14

We prove that $\psi_1(x) \leq \phi(x)$ (the proof that $\phi(x) \leq \psi_2(x)$ is similar).

Case 1: at first we consider the case when

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \phi_j(x) > \psi_1(x) \quad \text{a.e. in}\, \Omega. \tag{82}$$

Let $\beta_j := (\phi_j - \psi_1)^+ = \max\{\phi_j - \psi_1, 0\}$. By the Fatou Lemma we have

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \int_\Omega \beta_j(x)\eta(x)dx \geq \int_\Omega \liminf_{j\to+\infty} \beta_j(x)\eta(x)dx \geq 0 \tag{83}$$

for all $\eta \in L^2(\Omega)$ with $\eta \geq 0$ a.e. in Ω. Now we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega (\phi_j - \psi_1)^+(x)\eta(x)dx = \int_{\{x\in\Omega\colon \phi_j(x)\geq\psi_1(x)\}} (\phi_j - \psi_1)(x)\eta(x)dx = \\ &\quad \int_\Omega (\phi_j - \psi_1)(x)\eta(x)dx - \int_{\{x\in\Omega\colon \phi_j(x)<\psi_1(x)\}} (\phi_j - \psi_1)(x)\eta(x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Moreover, by using Hölder inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\{x\in\Omega\colon \phi_j(x)<\psi_1(x)\}} (\phi_j - \psi_1)(x)\eta(x)dx \right| \leq \\ &4 \left(\int_\Omega (|\phi_j(x)|^2 + |\psi_1(x)|^2)dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\{x\in\Omega\colon \phi_j(x)<\psi_1(x)\}} \eta^2(x)dx \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

Since by (47) ϕ_j is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ (see [1, Proposition III.5]), the first term of the right-hand side of (85) is finite, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &4 \left(\int_\Omega (|\phi_j(x)|^2 + |\psi_1(x)|^2)dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\{x\in\Omega\colon \phi_j(x)<\psi_1(x)\}} \eta^2(x)dx \right)^{1/2} \leq \\ &C \left(\int_{\{x\in\Omega\colon \phi_j(x)<\psi_1(x)\}} \eta^2(x)dx \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

with C a positive constant independent of j. Let $g_j := \eta^2 \chi_{\{x\in\Omega\colon \phi_j(x)<\psi_1(x)\}}$ and set

$$A := \{x \in \Omega \,:\, g_j(x) \not\to 0 \text{ as } j \to +\infty\}.$$

If $x \in A$ then we can construct a subsequence such that $\phi_{j_k}(x) < \psi_1(x)$, so passing to the limit we get

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \phi_j(x) \leq \liminf_{k\to+\infty} \phi_{j_k}(x) \leq \psi_1(x).$$

By comparing the last inequality and (82) we see that the measure of A is equal to 0 and so it follows that $g_j(x) \to 0$ a.e. in Ω. Since $|g_j| \leq \eta^2 \in L^1(\Omega)$, by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem we have

$$\lim_{j\to+\infty} \int_\Omega g_j(x)dx = \lim_{j\to+\infty} \int_{\{x\in\Omega\colon \phi_j(x)<\psi_1(x)\}} \eta^2(x)dx = 0. \tag{87}$$

By (83), (84), (85), (86) and (87) we get

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \int_\Omega (\phi_j - \psi_1)(x)\eta(x)dx = \liminf_{j\to+\infty} \int_\Omega (\phi_j - \psi_1)^+(x)\eta(x)dx \geq 0$$

and so by (47) it follows that

$$\int_\Omega (\phi - \psi_1)(x)\eta(x)dx \geq 0 \quad \forall \eta \in L^2(\Omega) \tag{88}$$

and from this we get

$$\phi(x) \geq \psi_1(x) \quad \text{a.e. in}\, \Omega$$

concluding the proof.

Case 2: now we assume that

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \phi_j(x) \geq \psi_1(x) \quad \text{a.e. in}\, \Omega.$$

For an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$ we set $\gamma_j := \phi_j + \epsilon$, therefore

$$\liminf_{j\to+\infty} \gamma_j(x) \geq \psi_1(x) + \epsilon > \psi_1(x) \quad \text{a.e. in}\,\Omega$$

and

$$\gamma_j \rightharpoonup \phi + \epsilon \quad \text{in}\, L^2(\Omega).$$

So, by *Case* 1, we have

$$\phi(x) + \epsilon \geq \psi_1(x) \qquad \text{a.e. in } \Omega$$

and for the arbitrariness of ϵ we can conclude the proof.

References

[1] H. Brézis, Analyse fonctionelle. Théorie et applications, *Masson*, Paris (1983).

[2] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci and E. Valdinoci, *Hitchhiker's guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces*, B. Sci. Math., in press, available on line at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1104.4345` .

[3] D. Mugnai, Lecture Notes, Università di Perugia, available on line at `http://www.dmi.unipg.it/∼mugnai/download/corso0.pdf` .

[4] P.H. Rabinowitz, Minimax methods in critical point theory with applications to differential equations, *CBMS Reg. Conf. Ser. Math.*, 65, *American Mathematical Society*, Providence, RI (1986).

[5] R. Servadei, *The Yamabe problem in a non–local setting*, preprint, available at `http://www.ma.utexas.edu/mp_arc-bin/mpa?yn=12-40` .

[6] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci, *A Brezis–Nirenberg result for non–local critical equations in low dimension*, preprint, available at `http://www.ma.utexas.edu/mp_arc-bin/mpa?yn=12-41` .

[7] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci, *Lewy-Stampacchia type estimates for variational inequalities driven by (non)local operators*, to appear in Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **29**, available online at `http://www.ma.utexas.edu/mp arc-bin/mpa?yn=11-103` .

[8] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci, *Mountain Pass solutions for non–local elliptic operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **389** (2012), no. 2, 887–898.

[9] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci, *The Brezis–Nirenberg result for the fractional Laplacian*, to appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., available online at `http://www.math.utexas.edu/mp_arc-bin/mpa?yn=11-196` .

[10] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci, *Variational methods for non-local operators of elliptic type*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **33** (2013), no. 5, 2105–2137.

(A. Fiscella) Dipartimento di Matematica “Federigo Enriques”, Università di Milano, Via Cesare Saldini, 50 20133 Milano ITALY

E-mail address: `alessio.fiscella@unimi.it`